HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 13 Saturday, March 30, 1957 Washington, D. C.

Printed in Two Sections

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

"Modern Republicanism": On Capitol Hill, no one questions the common assertion that the Eisenhower Administration is in hot water. The only question is "just how hot is the water?" The height of the temperature can be gauged inversely by the sharp descent in the status of "modern Republicanism" which, it must be recalled, was designed by the "liberal" Palace Guard as a bid for complete power in the GOP. That "doctrine" in the past week has reeled under triple blows which imperil not only its prestige but even its survival. They are as follows:

(1) The most obscene spectacle in recent American history — everyone agrees — was that of Teamster chief Dave Beck, friend of the GOP "liberals," taking the Fifth Amendment to avoid incrimination for defalcation of union funds. Unionism has undoubtedly suffered a crushing blow from this televised scene. And political alliance between GOP "liberals" and this type of leader, everyone in the Capital agrees, is now discredited.

But the cream of the grim political jest is that Mr. Beck's defense attorney was the first of the congressional Republicans to embrace "modern Republicanism." Senator Duff of Pennsylvania led the first band of GOP members of Congress to back Eisenhower for the Republican nomination and to oppose that of the conservative Senator Taft. In 1956, a majority of Pennsylvania voters threw Duff out of office.

These past few days, practicing lawyers in Washington ventured the opinion that Duff's fee for helping Beck was at least $50,000.

(2) The Eisenhower "welfare state" Budget is staggering under blows not only from the Democrats (in their new incarnation as "economizers") but also from Republicans on Capitol Hill. This week — according to those who attended the weekly White House session — was marked by GOP congressional leaders "laying down the law" to Eisenhower in person. They impressed on him — in no uncertain terms — that Governmental economy and fiscal solvency are the "very cornerstones" of the Republican party. And, raising their voices, they declared that the GOP on Capitol Hill is not going to let "the Democrats grab the economy ball and run with it." White House staffers showed pained surprise when members of the group talked of cutting foreign aid (Ike's pet extravagance) by at least $1 billion.

Later this week, when Ike at his press conference denounced piecemeal Budget cuts by Congress, Representative John Taber, ranking GOP member of the Appropriations Committee, acidly retorted that, in default of any other method (such as Ike's cutting his own Budget), "you have to take what you can get." And the House blazed defiance of the President's criticism by making more drastic cuts in the Labor Department money bill. Members obviously feel they have constituents behind them in slashing the Budget. It's not a contest — observers remark — in which Ike's "modern Republicanism" can win.

(3) And in the last 48 hours, GOP leaders on the Hill celebrated the funeral of one of the most extraordinary political creations in recent GOP history — the "Secret Sixteen," as it was known during its brief existence. (HUMAN EVENTS can exclusively report on this "inner sanctum" body, the existence of which was for many weeks known only to a handful of conservative Republicans on Capitol Hill.)

The "Secret Sixteen" (so-called, although estimates of membership run from a dozen to a score) was set up in January by extra-Governmental Presidential intimates — such as Paul Hoffman and Sidney Weinberg — to smother all independence in the party, especially among conservatives of the "Taft persuasion." It was composed of men who had never been elected to public office and all of whom were "modern Republicans" — to "shape policy" and to insure that selection of all appointments to high office would be controlled by "liberals" in the party. This group was to hold sway as a sort of party superstructure, over and above the GOP National Committee and the congressional GOP election committees. So far as can be ascertained now, the group held only two meetings. Then silence, obscurity, demise. Why?

One reason suggested (but not confirmed) is that H. Meade Alcorn, new GOP National Chairman, got wind of the "Secret Sixteen" and naturally protested to the White House. But that, in itself, would not be sufficient to kill the body.

The main reason for decline of the Sixteen stems from the decline of "modern Republicanism" itself, largely owing to the mass popular protest against the Eisenhower "modern Republican" Budget.

Not Merely Gossip: The Knowland-for-President boom last week received its greatest impetus to date. The fact that Governor Knight of California was closely linked with and received funds from Beck's Teamsters has greatly diminished Knight's chances for re-election as Governor next year. Many assume that he will retire from the race, leaving the way open for Knowland — who is popularly supposed to want the position as Governor of California as a stepping stone to the White House.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(In this connection, social gossips find significant the fact that the Knowlands have given up their apartment in Washington, sold their furniture and taken a suite in a downtown hotel.)

● Juiciest — and most significant — item to leak out from the otherwise uneventful meeting between British Prime Minister Macmillan and President Eisenhower in Bermuda was about Red China. Macmillan told Ike and Dulles that he appreciated their attitude on not recognizing Red China; and he expressed "sympathy" with the American policy of keeping Red China out of the United Nations. Diplomatic row says this is the first time since 1950, when Britain recognized the Red Peiping Government, that the British have evidenced such an attitude.

● Following failure of Dag Hammarskjold's mission to Egypt, insiders say that the White House has got John J. McCloy, Chairman of the Board of the Chase Manhattan Bank, to go on an unofficial mission to Cairo to see Nasser. It is speculated that Dulles is thus using McCloy to make another attempt to deal under the table with the Egyptian dictator.

● Much ado about nothing — that is the description given of the uproar over reported sharing of atomic warheads with Britain as a result of the Bermuda meeting. The warheads would presumably be put in intermediate guided missiles. But we possibly won't have any such missiles ready in production for some time. Anyway, the words "American custody" in official announcements are the key. American installations in Britain, Germany and Okinawa might have atomic warheads already. In Britain and Germany they have "custody"; what difference does it make — it is asked — whether the U.S. in these installations has "custody" or Britain or Germany? In case of war, they would go into instantaneous action.

● Walter Reuther, CIO chief, will be grilled by the McClellan Committee in the near future, according to some who are covering the Big Story. Corruption and personal misuse of union funds (*a la* Beck) will not be the subjects of the inquiry (for Reuther is said to be "clean" in that respect). But complicity in "terrorism" and "strike violence" certainly will be on the committee agenda, probably with reference to the long and bloody UAW strike against Kohler. It is believed that the Committee has a mass of material on these matters concerning Reuther. The conduct of the inquiry may be given to Senator McCarthy.

Curbing the Robber Bosses: Under the Dome, a babel of cries to legislate the Becks and Reuthers into comparative good conduct mounts as the McClellan Committee rolls on. But cooler heads urge caution and sober thinking before passing a lot of bills which might make bad conditions worse.

For instance, some legislators want union members to get full detailed reports of all union finances so they can check the depredations of the bosses. A necessary move, say labor experts, but only one step toward a solution of the problem. Others want meticulously detailed regulation of all activities of unions, which would create another extension of bureaucracy, thus swelling Big Government. Some proposals for regulation of unions would establish dangerous precedents for interference with affairs of other groups — colleges, lodges, churches, etc.

All this revives a reaction against "labor law," long disliked by many conservatives, which has led some to argue for complete abolition of all labor legislation, both of Wagner and Tart-Hartley Acts, sweeping the board clean so that the free market can take over.

However, those here who have devoted many years to studying labor matters, offer two courses which might serve to simplify reform measures:

(1) Get behind the amendment to the current civil rights bill, proposed by Senator Goldwater. This amendment, by banning compulsory unionism over the entire nation, would protect the "right to work" for individual workers; it is already being hailed as a Magna Charta for workers. Under the rubric of "civil rights," this Federal "right-to-work" measure would enjoy wider sanction and support than if it were simply a curb-the-labor-bosses statute. Its wider application would have more profound effects, it is believed, than a new and more complicated regulatory statute like the Taft-Hartley Act. Finally, some lawyers believe that it would pave the way for employers and individual employees to collect damages for losses of revenue or wages resulting from illegal strikes and secondary boycotts.

(2) Confine union activity by law solely to collective bargaining for wages and hours. This would, by one stroke, solve all sorts of problems — such as union operation of businesses (*a la* Frank Brewster), for that would be forbidden; engaging in political activities, or "educational activities" (the CIO mask for politics), for they would be prohibited.

After all, it is pointed out, the Wagner Act gave labor unions all sorts of Governmental and legal protection against labor-busting employers, and it was justified on the ground that it insured collective bargaining. It was never contemplated that unions would engage in all the multifarious (and nefarious) activities now so cryingly evident. Therefore, it is urged, unions should return to and stay within the original concept of labor legislation — the role of collective bargaining agents for workers — if they wish to enjoy the protection of existing law.

Disability Succession: Cloakroom word is that Attorney General Herbert Brownell next week will recommend to Congress legislation providing that the President can proclaim his own inability to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of his office, and delegate them to the Vice President.

Provision should also be made, Brownell will propose, whereby the President can recapture his powers by another simple proclamation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 13 HUMAN EVENTS March 30, 1957

Article Section

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Civil Rights Versus Natural Rights

By FRANK CHODOROV

CONGRESS IS BIG with a litter of "civil rights" bills. Activity in the two Committees on the Judiciary indicates that both Houses will soon be in labor pains. Unless public clamor or parliamentary maneuverings result in miscarriages, some of these pups will be inflicted on the public during the present session.

There is nothing in the purposes of these "rights" bills that bears more than a wordy resemblance to the American doctrine of natural rights or to the Constitutional Bill of Rights. Whatever comes out of Congress on this subject is likely to partake of centralism, which has long been the single greatest domestic threat to freedom.

The titles of these bills are misleading, perhaps designedly so, since they hint at some relation to the Declaration of Independence and bear a semantic reference to the Bill of Rights. But this is the old trick of using prestige words to make collectivist poison palatable. Before we take a swallow, we would do well to brush up on the indigenous American tradition of rights; it will then be seen that the words "civil" and "rights" on the labels of these bills are merely patent medicine words.

The American doctrine holds that men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." To be sure, the idea did not originate with Jefferson, for we find traces of it in the writings of the Stoics of ancient Greece, and it is indeed the political phrasing of the Christian doctrine of individual dignity. But, though the idea is of ancient vintage, the organization of the United States was the first attempt in history to found a nation on it. Though the Declaration of Independence is not the law of the land, and "unalienable rights" does not appear in the Constitution, the deliberations of the Founding Fathers were bounded by that frame of thought, and to this day, despite twistifications, it is the context of American polity. "I have a right," is the immediate reaction of every American who comes into conflict with authority, and legislators are under constant obligation to square their official acts with this tradition. Unless the "rights of the people" appears or is implied in the preamble of a proposed law it will not swallow well.

NOW, WE MUST never forget that the concept does not ascribe authority for these rights to the Government. They inhere in the individual by virtue of his existence and come with him when he is born. Government is instituted for the sole purpose of preventing a person (or a gang of persons, even a majority) from invading the rights of any person or persons coming under its protection. That is, the Government is a policeman only, having no other competence in the field of rights.

Above all — and here is the essence of Americanism — the Government is itself enjoined by this concept from using its monopoly of power to invade the God-given rights of the

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

individual. To pin down this injunction, the Bill of Rights was put into the Constitution. As every schoolboy should know, the Bill tells the Government "this is what you must not do."

What are these "unalienable rights"? The Declaration says that "among these are the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." John Locke, with whose writings the Founding Fathers were quite familiar, made it: "life, liberty and property." The Declaration is simply more extensive; unless a man is free to own and enjoy the product of his efforts, he has no liberty and his pursuit of happiness is delimited; a slave has no right to property.

Let us now consider the purport of the "civil rights" bills in relation to this enumeration of natural rights.

First, nothing is said in the latter about the right to vote; it would be difficult to maintain that participation in government is a prerogative that stems from God, and the Founding Fathers certainly did not so hold. Suffrage is a human convention, the rules of which are fixed by the majority. As a preventive for majority arrogance or ruthlessness, the Founding Fathers made the business of suffrage a local matter as far as feasible; each state made its own rules. In the beginning, all the states attached property qualifications to the voting privilege, and it was not until the modern era that women were allowed to vote. Even now there is an age qualification; also, aliens residing in the country, even though they must pay taxes and obey the laws, are not included in the electorate. Conviction of a crime automatically abrogates the voting privilege. Thus, suffrage is a concession, not a natural right.

BY NO STRETCH of the imagination can it be said that social equality is a natural right. In fact, one who so maintains inferentially denies the right of the individual to pursue happiness in the way he sees fit. Companionship is undoubtedly an essential ingredient of happiness, but only if it is congenial, and that is a matter of individual discrimination. A prudish woman would find little joy in being compelled to fraternize with a woman of light morals, a man of literary tastes would find no contentment in the company of illiterates — particularly if he had no choice in the matter. Association without discrimination is the rule of the prison, which is no place for pursuing happiness. A law which prescribes social integration, on any score, transgresses a natural right of man.

The energumens of "civil rights" are dead set against discriminatory practices on the grounds of race or religion in the hiring of employees. However, they find nothing wrong with laws that enable unions to exclude from employment those workers who do not wish to belong to them. One kind of discrimination is wrong, the other is right. Yet, the fact is that discrimination in the selection of business associates is a matter of conscience and convenience, a natural prerogative, and not within the scope of the law. If an employer prefers an incompetent worker to a competent one, for any reason, he may be acting foolishly, as the market will shortly inform him, but he does not violate a natural right; the worker cannot derive from his kinship to God any claim to a particular job. Likewise, the worker who refuses to work alongside another, for any reason, is pursuing happiness in his own peculiar way. Wherein in the nature of things is it writ that an atheist may demand employment in a religious publishing house?

In one respect the "civil rights" bills now pending do pay homage to natural rights; it is in a provision that some of them contain, outlawing lynching. Lynching is murder, which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is not only in violation of natural rights but is also in violation of statutes now on the books. Why this new concern with lynching, a form of homicide far less prevalent than love murders? The answer to this question lies in the enforcement clause that appears in various forms in all of these bills; it puts apprehension and punishment in the hands of Federal, rather than local, authorities, not only for lynching but also for violation of any of the proposed "civil rights" laws.

The title of one of these bills reveals the purpose of those pushing for their enactment. It reads: "To protect the civil rights of individuals by establishing a Commission of Civil Rights in the Executive branch of Government, a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, to strengthen the criminal laws protecting the civil rights of individuals, and for other purposes."

There we have the real motive of the agitation. The concern of the agitators is not in what is called "civil rights" but in the further strengthening of the Federal Government, the establishment of another powerful bureaucracy, the putting of another club in the hands of a national police. The title of another of these bills makes this point clear: "To declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States." That is to say, the citizen is to be deprived of the protection of his local government, over which he has some measure of control, and placed under the jurisdiction of a government less amenable to his inclinations. If he violates any provision of the "civil rights" legislation — even though in pursuance of his natural rights — he will be subject to arrest by Federal police and punishment by a Federal court; local sentiment, operating through a jury of peers, will not protect him. "Civil rights," therefore, becomes a vehicle for that concentration of power which the Bill of Rights specifically prohibits, and for the further downgrading of the authority of the states.

SPEAKING ON ONE of these bills, Representative William E. Miller (R.-N.Y.) said: "This bill in its present form gives no right, no privilege, no benefit to a single individual in the United States that he does not already have. But what does it do? It creates a commission with authority to subpoena us any place, to Washington, California or Texas, and hold us under subpoena at our own expense interminably. On what? Some allegation perhaps that I am exerting unwarranted economic pressure on somebody. Who? The corner grocer who alleges that I do not trade with him and get my friends not to trade with him because he is a Jew or a Catholic."

The bill in question, illustrative of the entire batch of bills, gives the Attorney General authority to hale into court a state official who, in performance of his duties, enforces local voting laws, whether in respect to literacy requirements, residential requirements or whatnot. It makes it possible for the proposed Commission to drag a man away from his home to a distant court, on its own whim or on a charge made by an unnamed neighbor, for examination of the "secret thoughts of his heart or of his secret opinion." Furthermore — and here we see how the proponents of "civil rights" think — it provides that the Commission may utilize the services of volunteers in the detection of violators of its decrees; thus it opens the door for that malicious snooping on neighbors and relatives that characterized nazism and is encountered in communistic countries. What would prevent the Commission from offering a fee for information leading to prosecution?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And would not the morally deficient collectivists be the most willing volunteers?

The target for this crop of "civil rights" laws is the South, where the impact of the infamous Reconstruction has left its mark in legal disabilities imposed on the Negro. The same racial prejudice is present in the North, but is more subtly expressed; as, for instance, the exodus of whites from Manhattan and Brooklyn to the suburbs of New York, leaving large residential districts in these two boroughs in possession of Negroes and Puerto Ricans. But in the South there are laws, and laws are more vulnerable to attack than social customs and habits of mind. The reason for selecting the anti-Negro laws of the South is purely political: the Negro vote is at stake.

If the truth were known, it would show that many of the Congressmen plugging for these laws, on humanitarian grounds, do not practice what they preach. In Washington, where Negroes constitute 35 per cent of the adult population and 70 per cent of the school population, these Congressmen move away from neighborhoods as the Negroes move in; they make sure that their children are educated either in public schools where Negroes constitute only one or two per cent of the student body, or else in private schools — which, though they do not discriminate against Negroes, are financially out of their reach. Except in political clubs, neither legislators nor their wives socialize with Negroes. Their enthusiasm for "civil rights" is in proportion to the number of Negro voters in their respective districts.

The "civil rights" bills, if enacted, will not accomplish the purposes ascribed to them. More likely, the prejudice, which the years have been gradually eroding, will be revived and exacerbated by this attempt to make people "good" by law. The difficulties of enforcement will in short order give these laws nothing but a nuisance value, for the purposes of professional do-gooders and determined collectivists. The politicians who are now urging these laws will lose interest in them as soon as the primary purpose, the capturing of the Negro vote, shall have been accomplished.

ONE MORE THING will remain. That is the accretion of power in the central Government. The bureaucracy will be enlarged, and to insure itself of an improvement of its perquisites and an expansion of its prerogatives, it will find reason for widening the provisions of the laws by "interpretation." For instance, there is some agitation at present for the abolition of college fraternities on the ground that these voluntary associations are discriminatory; the Commission could bestir itself in that direction. It could, by "interpretation," justify an investigation of discriminatory practices in the handling of unemployment funds on the local level; say, the exclusion of Communists from the largess, or the preference given them. Conceivably, the Commission might look into local laws putting disabilities on prostitutes. And so on.

The issue involved is not North versus South. Basically, it is constitutional government versus Government by Commission. It is "civil rights" versus natural rights.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately — at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is supposed to be the Administration's answer to the still-unresolved problem brought to the fore so forcibly by the President's 1955 coronary attack: what happens if a President, by reason of physical or mental illness, is unable to carry out the duties of his office?

Brownell's proposed program may be broadened at the last minute, because of widespread congressional feeling that it only partially answers the problem. Legislators note that it contains no provision whatever for the case of a President, for example, in a prolonged coma, or for any other reason unable to act for himself.

Guesses are that the ultimate solution will be some form of commission with authority to find a President incapable of acting, such as that proposed this week by Representative Kenneth Keating of New York.

A month ago, the issue was believed to be dead, at least for this year; the interest evidenced everywhere during and immediately after Mr. Eisenhower's illnesses has largely dissipated. In the past two or three weeks, however, it has revived as a result of a sudden spate of magazine and newspaper articles.

It was given a further fillip by the tragic death of Filipino President Ramon Magsaysay. For several hours no trace was found of the plane which carried him to death; suppose some similar accident took the life of our President, and the plane was missing for any prolonged time? Farfetched, it is admitted, but nevertheless conceivable in this age of jet propulsion.

The New Townsend Plan: What is the motive power behind the truly unprecedented demand from constituents to cut Government spending? One big element — according to legislators who have pondered this epoch-making phenomenon — is the revolt of the "old folks," or — more precisely — all middle-aged and older persons who feel in their bones, if they do not clearly see, that their interests are imperilled by inflation. That they correctly correlate Government spending with the deterioration of the dollar is a measure of the advance of public thinking on economic matters since the wild "funny money" days of the Thirties.

These older people — millions of them — either live or count on living on fixed income from investments or on pensions provided by private business, insurance companies or Government. They are undoubtedly haunted by the fear of eventual destitution as a result of a runaway inflation and a ruined currency.

The new "Townsendites" think about their problems in a context quite different from that of their predecessors in the Thirties.

Old Doc Townsend and his friends — back in the days of the Depression — demanded $200 a month for everyone over the age of 65, a sum which had to be spent as received, and the big argument was that expenditure of such sums on a grand scale would revive business conditions. Today, obviously, business does not need to be "revived." "Full employment" and too much individual credit has raised the specter of a runaway inflation, with cruel losses to such older folks.

Hence today, the new conditions, so radically different from those of the Thirties, have generated public and group reactions entirely unexpected by the "liberal" eggheads (for instance Leon Keyserling, the economic "thinker" of the CIO) who for long have guided economic thinking in the political arena. In short, the Fifties have paved the way for a reincarnated Herbert Spencer to appear and to tell Keynes to move over.

Civil Liberties: As the struggle over pending "civil rights" legislation comes to a head in Congress, the "liberals" have begun to fight under their true colors — revealing that their aim is to destroy constitutional rights, not to preserve them.

This is the reading given to last week's developments in the "civil rights" battle. Senator Sam J. Ervin (D.-N.C.), marshalling impressive arguments, has charged that involvement of the Federal Government in "discrimination" cases would rob defendants of their right to trial by jury. Last week, Senator Hennings, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, confirmed this charge with a memorandum to the Judiciary Committee. "We know," stated the memorandum, "that, regardless of the facts, juries in some cases are not likely to convict. An alternative is the grant of injunctive relief to the United States." The *Daily Worker* hailed this statement with a banner headline: "Hennings Answers 'Jury' Cry of Civil Rights Foes."

This turn of events has convinced experienced observers that the "civil rights" proponents have suffered a serious setback. Hennings' memorandum is viewed as a damaging admission which could cause widespread popular revulsion, North and South. It is generally agreed that Ervin has caught the "liberals" red-handed, and that, to be enacted during this session, "civil rights" legislation will have to rule out "government by injunction." (See "Civil Rights Versus Natural Rights," by Frank Chodorov, in article section of this issue.)

Alaska: Although revelations of Communist domination of the Hawaiian islands make it unlikely that Hawaii will achieve statehood in the near future, efforts to put Alaska in the Union have intensified. Representative John R. Pillion (R.-N.Y.), who has long urged that Congress abandon efforts to reap partisan advantage from this controversy, places the question in the perspective of national interest: Alaska, Pillion believes, is not ready for statehood. The total civilian population of Alaska, he points out, is 161,000 — about one one-thousandth of the population of the U.S. Statehood would give this territory two Senators and three electoral votes — a vastly dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proportionate leverage on the course of affairs in the United States.

Moreover, Pillion told HUMAN EVENTS, Alaska, as a new state, would represent a drain on the United States Treasury. Territorial income for 1956 is estimated at about $500 million. But only $145 million of this represents income from basic Alaskan industries; the rest consists of spending by the U.S. Federal Government.

There is some feeling in the Capital that the main effect of Alaskan statehood would be to strengthen the case of "Federal Aid" advocates, who are constantly in search of needy states that they can "help."

Meanwhile, Congressman A. L. Miller (R.-Neb.), ranking member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has been conducting a poll among Alaskans themselves to discover Territorial sentiment about statehood. Miller's poll, handled through five Alaskan newspapers and ten radio stations, is producing unexpected results. As early returns — possibly a tenth — come in, sentiment is running three to one *against* statehood. Miller's office informed HUMAN EVENTS that the Congressman viewed these first results as "amazing."

Supreme Court: Capital conservatives feel that, in one important respect, President Eisenhower's recent Supreme Court appointments have produced an "even split." Senator McCarthy's questioning of the first of the new appointees, William Brennan, left considerable doubt as to Brennan's real position on how to handle the domestic Communist conspiracy. But the second nominee, Charles Evans Whittaker, is hailed as a forthright anti-Communist who will strengthen the conservative position in the High Court.

Those who offer this characterization support their view by citing Whittaker's decision, as a Federal judge, in the case of Horace B. Davis. After refusing to answer questions with regard to possible Communist affiliations, Davis had been discharged from his teaching position at the University of Kansas City. In the court battle that followed, Whittaker ruled that not only did the University trustees have the "right" to discharge Davis, but that they would have been "derelict in their duties, and would have destroyed the university, if they had not dismissed him." Davis had a right to use the Fifth Amendment, said Whittaker, "but he did not have a constitutional right to remain a . . . school teacher."

Justice Whittaker, who ascended to the High Court last week, also has a "conservative" record on labor questions, and is expected to strengthen the Court's position on that count. On other crucial constitutional questions, such as the Bricker Amendment and States' Rights issues, Whittaker is considered an "unknown quantity."

Harvard: "You can always tell a Harvard man, but you can't tell him much," is an old saying which may be revived in connection with a developing controversy involving the University and Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer.

A group of Harvard men has formed the Harvard "Veritas" Committee and has written a letter to Harvard alumni protesting the appointment of Dr. Oppenheimer as William James lecturer in philosophy at Harvard. The "Veritas" Committee believes that the motto "Veritas" (Truth) on the Harvard shield should be observed. The Committee cannot reconcile this motto with the known record of Oppenheimer, who has admitted he lied to a U.S. security officer charged with the duty of protecting the atomic weapons project against spies. The Majority Report of the Atomic Energy Commission said: "We find Dr. Oppenheimer is not entitled to the continued confidence of this Government and of this Commission because of fundamental defects in his 'character.'"

The Harvard "Veritas" Committee (P. O. Box 340, New York 5, N. Y.) asks alumni to urge the Harvard Overseers to review and reconsider the Oppenheimer appointment.

Book Event: The publication of *The Labor Policy of the Free Society* by Professor Sylvester Petro (The Ronald Press, New York; $5) signalizes the lifting of the pall of intellectual obscurantism which for twenty-odd years has thwarted the free examination of the activities of labor unions. Even five years ago, such a book as this probably would not have been written, or if written, could not have obtained a publisher (such has been the intimidating grip of "liberalism").

This professor at New York University (once a worker and member of a union himself) in the present volume, sharply criticizes picketing, secondary boycotts, and compulsory union membership and sets forth concrete recommendations in our labor laws, including the repeal of the Norris-La Guardia Act and the abolition of the National Labor Relations Board. He measures the activities of the Becks and Reuthers against the principles of a free society of free enterprise and private property — and finds them sadly wanting.

All books reviewed or condensed in HUMAN EVENTS may be obtained, at the bookstore price, from The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, New York.

Letter from MILTON M. LORY, President, American Coalition of Patriotic Societies: "When the lights of crusading pro-American journalism are going out one by one or being dimmed by expediency, it is reassuring to know that HUMAN EVENTS is one of the few remaining beacons piercing the engulfing darkness.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.
Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year, by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED